

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

RICHARD KADREY, *et al.*,

Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware
corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER REGARDING COMPETING
CASE SCHEDULE PROPOSALS**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-12, Plaintiffs Richard Kadrey, Sarah Silverman, Christopher Golden, Jacqueline Woodson, Andrew Sean Greer, Rachel Louise Snyder, David Henry Hwang, Ta-Nehisi Coates, Laura Lippman, Matthew Klam, Junot Díaz, Lysa Terkeurst and Christopher Farnsworth (collectively, the “Plaintiffs”); and Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Meta”) (together, the “Parties”), by and through their respective counsel, stipulate to the following:

1. The Parties participated in a Case Management Conference before the Presiding Judge on July 11, 2025.
2. At that Conference, the Parties and the Court discussed presenting discovery disputes to Magistrate Judge Hixson that originate from the Court’s prior orders on additional discovery

(Dkt. 470; *see also* Dkt. 500) before proceeding with supplemental expert reports and summary judgment briefing.

3. On July 17, the Parties filed a stipulation and proposed order setting forth a joint discovery letter briefing schedule to Judge Hixson on discovery disputes, which was approved by the Court on July 28, 2025. (Doc. No. 614)
4. On August 1, 2025, Judge Hixson ruled on the discovery disputes. Neither party filed objections under Rule 72 to Judge Hixson's order, which were due no later than August 15, 2025.
5. Meta expects to produce documents pursuant to Judge Hixson's order and a corresponding privilege log the week of August 25, 2025.
6. The Parties have met and conferred about the schedule and have reached agreement on the expert deadlines and sealing procedures for the summary judgment briefing, but were not able to reach agreement on the briefing deadlines.
7. The Parties have discussed and agree to a schedule for the expert reports and depositions authorized at the July 11, 2025 Case Management Conference, as set forth below.
8. For the sealing procedures, the parties agree to follow a procedure similar to what the Court ordered for the first set of summary judgment briefing (Doc. No. 477), as set forth below.
9. With respect to the briefing deadlines, the Parties submit their proposed schedules below, along with a brief explanation of their respective positions.

10. Plaintiffs' Proposed Briefing Schedule and Brief Explanation:

| Event | Date |
|---|-------------------|
| Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment | November 21, 2025 |
| Meta's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment, Meta's Motion for Summary Judgment, and its Motions to Exclude | December 8, 2025 |
| Plaintiffs' Reply in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment, Opposition to Meta's Motion for Summary Judgment, Oppositions to Meta's Motions to Exclude, and Plaintiffs' Motions to Exclude | December 23, 2025 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Meta's Reply in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment and its Oppositions to Plaintiffs' Motions to Exclude | January 8, 2026 |
| Hearing | January 22, 2026 or at the Court's preference |

Plaintiffs' proposed schedule is driven by a desire to progress this case swiftly, while ensuring that holiday schedules are affected as little as possible. Plaintiffs' proposed schedule accommodates Meta's request for four weeks to serve its Rebuttal Report, and also grants Meta with three additional days to respond. At the same time, Plaintiffs' proposed schedule aims to provide a balanced approach to briefing and filing over Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year's Day by ensuring that filings largely occur well in advance of holidays. For example, while Plaintiffs' proposed schedule requires Plaintiffs to file their Opposition and other motions two days before Christmas, Meta's proposed schedule includes an initial filing for Plaintiffs the day before Thanksgiving, as well as a December 23 filing. Plaintiffs believe this schedule is appropriate given the importance of the issues and the posture of the case: the factual and legal issues relevant to this round of summary judgment briefing are narrower than the last round—including the discovery and expert reports on which the parties will rely. Plaintiffs' proposal also complies with the Court's Standing Order by allowing 14 days between submission of the final brief and the hearing date and avoids an unnecessarily protracted briefing schedule, opening up the possibility of a January hearing on issues of national importance.

Meta's Proposed Briefing Schedule and Brief Explanation:

| Event | Date |
|---|-------------------|
| Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment | November 26, 2025 |
| Meta's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment, Meta's Motion for Summary Judgment, and its Motions to Exclude | December 23, 2025 |
| Plaintiffs' Reply in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment, Opposition to Meta's Motion for Summary Judgment, Oppositions to Meta's Motions to Exclude, and Plaintiffs' Motions to Exclude | January 22, 2026 |
| Meta's Reply in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment and its Oppositions to | February 5, 2026 |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Plaintiffs' Motions to Exclude | |
| 2 | Hearing | February 19, 2026 or at the Court's preference |

3 Meta has proposed a briefing schedule that is consistent with the schedule discussed at the
4 July 11, 2025 Case Management Conference, but that also recognizes that much of this
5 briefing will fall over the Thanksgiving and end of year holidays, and as such shares that
6 burden of briefing over holidays equally between the parties. At the July 11 CMC, Meta
7 proposed that Plaintiffs would file its brief "several weeks" after the expert discovery was
8 completed, and that the "second brief" filed by Meta would be filed "[a] month later," which
9 the Court expressed agreement with. 2025-07-11 Tr. At 20:7-16 ("THE COURT: Yes. I
10 mean, all of that sounds fine to me."). Consistent with the Court's guidance, Meta's
11 proposal allows both sides approximately one month to prepare their respective second and
12 third briefs. Meta's proposal also puts Meta's second brief over the Thanksgiving holiday
13 and Plaintiffs' third brief over the Christmas and New Year's holidays, sharing the burden
14 among both sides of briefing over the holidays. In contrast, Plaintiffs' schedule would
15 require Meta to prepare briefing over both the Thanksgiving holiday and the Christmas and
16 New Years' holidays. Plaintiffs state that they want the briefing completed to have the
17 possibility of a January summary judgment hearing, without explaining any particular need
18 for that date or the burdensome schedule they propose to meet it. Particularly troubling is
19 Plaintiffs' proposal for Meta's fourth brief, as Plaintiffs would serve their third brief the day
20 before Christmas Eve and it would be due during the first full week after the New Year's
21 holiday. Many Meta personnel will be out and unavailable during this time period,
22 substantially interfering with counsel's ability to coordinate with Meta on this filing. Meta's
23 schedule avoids jamming either party in this manner, while completing the briefing only
24 one month later than Plaintiffs, allowing for a hearing in February. Meta is also amenable
25 to further extending its proposed dates for the third and fourth briefs by another week, if
26 Plaintiffs would prefer additional time for their third brief, so as not to impose any undue
27 burden over the holidays.
28

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and through Plaintiffs and Meta, as represented by their undersigned counsel and subject to the approval of the Court, that:

1. The Parties shall adhere to the following schedule for the expert reports and depositions authorized at the July 11, 2025 Case Management Conference:

| Event | Agreed Deadline |
|--|--------------------|
| Plaintiffs' Expert Report | September 30, 2025 |
| Meta Rebuttal to Plaintiffs' Expert Report | October 30, 2025 |
| Deadline to Complete Expert Depositions | November 10, 2025 |

2. The parties shall adhere to the following procedures for sealing materials related to the summary judgment briefing authorized by this Order under Local Rule 79-5(f):

- The parties shall confer no later than five business days after the filing of each summary judgment brief to decide what, if anything, should be left redacted in that brief. The parties must file new versions of the briefs (as well as a new request to seal anything left redacted) within three business days of conferring.
- With respect to exhibits, the parties shall confer and ultimately file unredacted or less redacted versions of any exhibits no fewer than three business days before the summary judgment hearing. At this time, the parties shall also file a table summarizing all outstanding motions to seal.

3. For the summary judgment briefing authorized by the Court at the July 11, 2025 Case Management Conference, the Parties shall adhere to:

_____ Plaintiffs' Proposed Schedule

_____ Meta's Proposed Schedule.

Dated: August 22, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Elizabeth L. Stameshkin

By: /s/ Maxwell V. Pritt

Bobby A. Ghajar
Colette Ani Ghazarian
COOLEY LLP
1333 2nd Street, Suite 400
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Telephone: (310) 883-6400
Facsimile: (310) 883-6500
Email: bghajar@cooley.com
cghazarian@cooley.com

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
David Boies (*pro hac vice*)
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
(914) 749-8200
dboies@bsfllp.com

Mark R. Weinstein
Matthew Brigham
Elizabeth Lee Stameshkin
COOLEY LLP
3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone: 650-843-5000
Facsimile: 650-849-7400
Email: mweinstein@cooley.com
Email: mbrigham@cooley.com
Email: lstameshkin@cooley.com

Maxwell V. Pritt (SBN 253155)
Joshua M. Stein (SBN 298856)
Margaux Poueymirou (SBN 356000)
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 293-6800
mpritt@bsfllp.com
jstein@bsfllp.com
mpoueymirou@bsfllp.com

Kathleen R. Hartnett
Judd D. Lauter
COOLEY LLP
3 Embarcadero Center, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4004
Telephone: (415) 693-2071
Facsimile: (415) 693-2222
Email: khartnett@cooley.com

Jesse Panuccio (*pro hac vice*)
Jay Schuffenhauer (*pro hac vice*)
1401 New York Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 237-2727
jpanuccio@bsfllp.com
jschuffenhauer@bsfllp.com

Angela Dunning
CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN &
HAMILTON LLP
1841 Page Mill Road, Suite 250
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1248
Telephone: (650) 815-4131
Email: adunning@cgsh.com

Joshua I. Schiller (SBN 330653)
David L. Simons (*pro hac vice*)
55 Hudson Yards, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10001
(914) 749-8200
jischiller@bsfllp.com
dsimons@bsfllp.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

*Attorneys for Defendant
META PLATFORMS, INC.*

PROPOSED ORDER

Pursuant to the stipulation of the Parties, **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: _____

HON. VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge

ECF ATTESTATION

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that counsel for Plaintiffs concurs in the filing of this document.

/s/ Elizabeth L. Stameshkin